



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,175	02/20/2001	Shigeru Fujita	024304-00000	2341

7590 05/10/2005

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,175

Applicant(s)

FUJITA, SHIGERU

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's request for continued examination. Claim 5 has been added. Claims 1-5 are presented for further examination.

Response to Arguments

2> Applicant's arguments filed 1.21.2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant is arguing in substance, that in the sections cited by Examiner, Castor does not disclose a client having "server functionality so that it executes processing of application or applications in response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued such requests" [see page 5].

The important point argued by Applicant is that the limitations are not in the "passages of Castor cited by Examiner" because while the specific limitations may not be in the cited sections, the Castor reference does disclose all of the limitations of the claims. Castor discloses an embodiment of his invention where a request is transmitted from one client to another client that has server functionality so that it executes processing of applications in response to the requests, and subsequently outputs their results of this processing back to the client who requested the processing [column 2 «lines 62-67» | column 7 «lines 21-26» | column 8 «lines 31-42» where : Castor discloses "indicating the results of the executed procedure". This is interpreted as outputting the results of the processing]. Castor is directed towards speeding response times to requests in a data network. Castor solves this

Art Unit: 2152

problem by enabling any the plurality of clients in his network with the ability to handle the requests from the other clients in the network.

The reference should be considered as a whole and not merely the cited passages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4> Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castor et al, U.S Patent No. 5,590,288 ["Castor"] in view of Lum, U.S Patent No. 6,272,529.

5> As to claim 1, Castor teaches a distributed processing system comprising a plurality of clients, wherein at least one of said clients is operable in standalone fashion and has server functionality so that it executes processing in response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued such requests [abstract | Figure 1 | column 2 «lines 62-67» | column 6 «lines 20-52» | column 7 «lines 21-26» | column 8 «lines 31-42»].

Castor does not teach that the clients are linked in series.

Art Unit: 2152

6> Lum teaches that clients in a distributed processing system can be linked in series [column 2 «lines 53-58» | column 5 «lines 31-36»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect Castor's clients in series so that the clients can be freely integrated and removed from the system without the need for reconfiguring or rebooting the system.

7> As to claim 3, Castor teaches a plurality of clients, wherein at least one of said clients is operable in standalone fashion and has server functionality so that it executes processing of application or applications in response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued such requests [abstract | Figure 1 | abstract | Figure 1 | column 2 «lines 62-67» | column 6 «lines 20-52» | column 7 «lines 21-26» | column 8 «lines 31-42»].

Castor does not teach that the clients are linked in series.

8> Lum teaches that clients can be linked in series [column 2 «lines 53-58» | column 5 «lines 31-36»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect Castor's clients in series so that the clients can be freely integrated and removed from the system without the need for reconfiguring or rebooting the system.

Art Unit: 2152

9> Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castor and Lum as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, in further view of Moderi et al, U.S Patent No. 5,510,979 ["Moderi"].

10> As to claim 2, Castor does not specifically teach a distributed processing system wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration.

11> Moderi teaches a distributed processing system wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration [column 13 «lines 19-46» | column 15 «line 19» to column 16 «line 40»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Moderi's security and authentication functionality into Castor's distributed processing system so that employee identification information can be stored in a central location but accessed from multiple terminals.

Art Unit: 2152

12> As to claim 4, Castor does not specifically teach clients wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration.

13> Moderi teaches clients wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration [column 13 «lines 19-46» | column 15 «line 19» to column 16 «line 40»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Moderi's security and authentication functionality into Castor's clients so that employee identification information can be stored in a central client but accessed from multiple connected client.

14> Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nazari, U.S Patent No. 6,374,248, in view of Castor, in further view of Lum.

15> Nazari discloses a distributed processing system comprising:
at least one server [Figure 1 «item 122»].

Nazari also discloses wherein at least one client is operable in standalone fashion and

Art Unit: 2152

has server functionality when the at least one server goes down. [column 4 «lines 21-29»], but does not explicitly disclose a plurality of clients linked in series, wherein the plurality of clients are linked to the at least one server, and wherein the standalone server executes processing in response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued requests.

16> Castor discloses a plurality of clients, wherein the plurality of clients are linked to a server, and wherein one of said clients executes processing in response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued such requests [column 2 «lines 62-67» | column 6 «lines 20-52» | column 7 «lines 21-26» | column 8 «lines 31-42»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Castor's plurality of clients into Nazari's distributed file system. Such an implementation would provide well known advantages in the art such as enabling multiple clients access to the files in the storage device.

17> Lum teaches that clients in a distributed processing system can be linked in series [column 2 «lines 53-58» | column 5 «lines 31-36»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect Nazari and Castor's clients in series so that the clients can be freely integrated and removed from the system without the need for reconfiguring or rebooting the system.

Art Unit: 2152

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



Dung C. Li
Primary Examiner